

REMARKS

Following several telephonic discussions with Examiner Meng An, it was agreed that claims 12-23, 25-39, and 42-45 would be allowed. The remaining claims that were pending have been canceled without prejudice. Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for her reconsideration of this case, and applicants look forward to receiving a Notice of Allowance.

Explanation of certain formalities concerning claims and claim status

Applicant notes that this paper is the second paper that has been filed in response to the December 12, 2005 Final Rejection. A Rule 1.116 Amendment was filed on February 6, 2006. However, the March 14, 2006 Advisory Action does not indicate that the 2/6/2006 Amendment was entered, and therefore applicant has assumed that the 2/6/2006 amendment was not entered. Thus, the claim amendments in this paper show the changes relative to the state in which the claims existed at the time of the 12/12/2005 Final Rejection.

Additionally, upon further review of this case, applicant's attorney discovered certain discrepancies in claim status in prior papers. It is believed that the claim status issues are addressed by this paper. For the sake of completeness, applicant notes the following:

- Claim 21 was marked in the 2/6/2006 paper as original, although it should have been marked as previously presented due to an earlier amendment. Additionally, the prior recitation of claim 21 included language that had not been added by the earlier amendment. Applicants have now marked claim 21 as currently amended in order to formally add that language to claim 21. The change is a formality and does not affect the substance or introduce new matter.

- Claims 22 and 27 were marked in the 2/6/2006 paper as original, although they should have been marked as previously presented due to an earlier amendment.

- The listing of claim 37 in the 2/6/2006 paper incorrectly reflects the pre-amendment status of that claim, in that the non-underlined language in item (d) says "said first set of instructions," when it should have reflected that the claim had been amended to say "said first of said sets of instructions". The present listing of the claim reflects the correct prior status of claim 37. Additionally, applicant has made other amendments to claim 37 in this paper to make the "said first of said sets of instructions" language consistent throughout. Since claim

DOCKET NO.: USYS-0056/TN172
Application No.: 09/468,469
Office Action Dated: December 12, 2005

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

45 is a computer-readable medium version of claim 37, applicants have similarly amended claim 45. This change is a formality, and does not affect the substance of claim 37 or introduce new matter.

- The listing of claim 43 in the 2/6/2006 paper includes the term "indications" in the third line of the claim; the term should be "indication".

Applicant notes that the listing of claims filed with the July 25, 2005 amendment may have had similar issues, but applicant believes these are addressed by the present listing of claims. If the Examiner finds any minor issues remaining, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve these issues.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant submits that this case is now in condition for allowance.

Date: May 12, 2006



Peter M. Ullman
Registration No. 43,963

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439